DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 128 552 CE 005 156

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Antholz, Mary B.; And Others |
| TITLE | The Social Contribution of Work. A Career Education Resource Guide. Minnesota Guidance Series. Learning Opportunities Package E. |
| INSTITUTION | Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Coll. of Education. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Minnesota State Dept. of Education, St. Paul. Pupil Personnel Services Section. |
| PUB DATE | 72 |
| NOTE | 32p.; For related documents see CE 005 151-158. Page 30 of the original document is copyrighted and therefore not available. It is not included in the pagination |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Career Education; Educational Objectives; Job Satisfaction; *Learning Activities; Learning Modules; Occupational Aspiration; Resource Guides; Resource Materials; Secondary Education; Self Actualization; Senior High Schools; *Social Influences; Teaching Guides; *Work Attitudes |

ABSTRACT

The five enabling objectives and related learning experiences presented in this learning package help the student to examine his own abilities and attitudes for ways in which he can contribute to society through his work, help foster in him a realization of the value and importance of work performed at all levels, and encourage him to use his vocational abilities to meet the needs for change which confront society. The student objectives are: (1) To identify the social contribution of workers at different socioeconomic levels, (2) to identify ways in which society is benefited by the willingness of individuals to utilize their abilities in vocational tasks, (3) to give examples of ways in which business and labor organizations operate on the principle of private interest versus social responsibility, (4) to describe the personal values and the social contributions of participation in community affairs as part of one's career, and (5) to describe how work in America may help to overcome the social problems threatening mankind. This package is one of a series developed for use at the high school level and may be implemented through the traditional subject areas or taught by teachers and/or counselors as self-contained mini-courses or group guidance units. Activities related to the enabling objectives are appended. (TA)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

ED128552

Learning Opportunities Package E
Code: XXXIII-A-30

# THE SOCIAL CONTRIBUTION OF WORK

A Career Education Resource Guide

by

Mary B. Antholz
Lorraine S. Hansen
Mary K. Klaurens
W. Wesley Tennyson

University of Minnesota
College of Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A publication of the Minnesota Guidance Series prepared with funds made available under provisions of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended 1968 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title III

CE 005 156

Pupil Personnel Services Section
Minnesota Department of Education
St. Paul

1972

## RATIONALE

America today is confronted with many problems, including the assimilation of youth into the world of work or "system." Many youths today suffer from a sense of alienation from society. The young worker may feel that he is powerless to make the system more responsive to his needs and those of others. The increasing industrialization and division of labor into minute acts seemingly unrelated to any whole decreases the worker's confidence in the importance of his work. Although we as a nation strive to overcome prejudices and biases based on sex and race, we still maintain class consciousness in the equally artificial form of high and low status jobs. As a consequence, the young worker may develop very little feeling of self-worth through his job.

The size and complexity of society which produces this feeling of inconsequence also fosters a tendency to compartmentalize one's life: a job is for making money, social problems are relegated to after hours, if one has time. All too often, one hasn't.

A growing number of disaffected youth carry this one step further and conclude that one can work at a regular job or one can be concerned about the future of society, but not both. Many very talented and intelligent youths are choosing to be concerned, are choosing not to become part of the economic system. A society or culture cannot survive or grow unless its values are perpetuated in its young.

This learning package attempts to help the student examine his own abilities and attitudes to see how he can contribute to society through his work, to foster in him a realization of the value and importance of work performed at all levels, and to encourage him to use his vocational abilities to meet the needs for change which confront society.

### Suggestions for Use of the Material

This package is one of a series developed for use at the high school level. Constituting a career development curriculum (CDC), these packages identify important concepts of self and community which too often are left at the periphery of the curriculum. They focus on the kinds of social issues and vital themes which make up real life and are of concern to young people.

The career development objectives and learning activities contained in this and other packages of the series may be implemented through the traditional subject areas or they may be taught by teachers and/or counselors as self-contained mini-courses or group guidance units. A teacher who wishes to incorporate career development activities in her course of study has the option of teaching an entire package or selecting those enabling objectives and learning opportunities which interest her most, fit her time schedule, or best meet the needs of her students. In choosing this latter option, however, the teacher should be aware that there is a sequential ordering of the enabling objectives within any one package. The sequencing moves from basic concepts to more complex concepts.

Ideally, a coordinated approach which distributes these learning activities throughout all subject areas of the curriculum is recommended. Such an approach may be achieved where teachers of the various disciplines, in consort with each other, identify those objectives and activities having relevance for their respective areas and incorporate these activities in an overall curriculum plan.

## THE SOCIAL CONTRIBUTION OF WORK

### Terminal Performance Goals

The student will

1) Explain how one may contribute to society through his work.

2) Describe the contribution of a wide range of various occupations to society.

3) Describe how a person's career may be a means to effect social change.

### Enabling Objectives

EO#1 Identifies the social contribution of workers at different socio-economic levels.

#### Learning Experiences

1) Ask each student to list all the workers whose contributions affect his life between the time he gets up in the morning and the time he gets to school, such as milkman, paper boy, radio disc jockey, breakfast food manufacturer. Split the class into groups to compare lists and to try to determine if one category is more important than the others, giving reasons for the choices.

2) Hand out copies of "Two Points of View" (see Appendix, p.11). Have students read the quotations, then answer and be prepared to discuss the accompanying study questions.

3) Have students prepare an individual college or group bulletin board which demonstrates the diversity of occupations necessary to our society. Newspaper and magazine pictures and ads, as well as original art work and photography may be utilized. This learning experience may be combined with EO#1-1 by limiting the occupations represented in the collage to those with which the student is in daily contact.

4) Ask students to imagine that a nuclear holocaust is destroying the earth. There is still time to send a spaceship to a distant planet which has atmospheric and geological conditions similar to those of Earth, but the spaceship can carry only 12 persons, plus the crew. Each student is given the role of a different worker (see Appendix, p.12 for list of suggested workers), and is asked to prepare a brief talk explaining why he, as the representative of his field, should be included on the spaceship. Students may wish to interview workers in the field as well as consulting standard references for occupational information, such as the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, the Occupational Outlook Handbook or the Encyclopedia of Careers. The teacher may evaluate the speeches and determine

the survivors or each student may be asked to list the 12 he feels should be on the ship, along with his reasons for choosing them. In the latter case, the class might wish to compile a composite list to determine the survivors.

5) Students are to investigate the effect of strikes. Each student or group of students should take a specific strike and prepare a written or oral report explaining what happened when a particular group of workers withheld its services. Students should consider the following questions:
   a) How did the strike affect the workers involved?
   b) How did the strike affect the industry?
   c) How did the strike affect the public?
   d) In what ways did the strike harm society?
   e) In what ways did the strike benefit society?

6) Students should read Walt Whitman's "I Hear America Singing" (see Appendix, p.13) and discuss the accompanying questions in small groups.

7) Have the students ask a relative or neighbor if he feels his job contributes to the well-being of society, and if so, how. Discuss the results in small groups, using the study questions from EO#1-2 (Appendix, p.11) as a guide.

EO#2 Identifies ways in which society is benefited by the willingness of individuals to utilize their abilities in vocational tasks.

Learning Experiences

1) Adam Smith teaches that "Division of labor is the great cause" of increased productivity. Have students read the excerpt from Smith's The Wealth of Nations (see Appendix, p.15) and consider the attached stimulus questions.

2) Ask students to interview a person in their community they feel has made the community a better place to live. They may do this on an individual basis, reporting back to the class, or the class as a whole may select a person to be interviewed. It is essential that all categories of workers, blue collar as well as white collar, be considered in this exercise. Students should consider the following questions for discussion:
   a) What has the person done to make the community a better place to live?
   b) How has he done this?
   c) Why has he done this?

   The class may wish to award a certificate to the individual they feel has made outstanding contributions. As an adjunct to this activity, students might write a paragraph answering the question "How can I use my vocational abilities to make my community a better place to live?"

EO#3 Gives examples of ways in which business and labor organizations operate on the principle of private interest versus social responsibility.

Learning Experiences

1) Students should debate the topic "Resolved: that defense contractors who produce war materials in the 'National interest' are demonstrating private interest rather than social responsibility." The teacher may wish to assign sides, pointing out that much of the value of a good debate may come from supporting with fact and argument a view which is not necessarily one's own. Students not participating directly in the debate may serve as researchers or judges. Each student may be asked to turn in a position paper stating and supporting his view of the issue. Students should consult the Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature for help in locating relevant source material.

2) Have students prepare a list of local businesses which are actual or potential pollutants. Then have students, working in pairs, choose a business from the list and interview company officials to determine what is or is not being done to combat or prevent pollution. Before interviewing, the class may discuss the kinds of information they are looking for, and how best to get that information. They should then report back to the class as a whole. In preparing their reports, students should consider the following questions:
   a) Is there a problem now? What is the extent of it?
   b) Is there a potential problem? What is the extent of it?
   c) What can be done about a) and/or b)?
   d) What is being done?
   e) If there is a discrepancy between c) and d), why:
      1) expense?
      2) lack of concern?
      3) other causes? (list)

3) Invite union and/or management officials who have been recently or are currently involved in a strike to discuss that strike as reflecting private interest or social responsibility. Have students acquaint themselves with the issues of the strike through news reports, then prepare questions to ask the speakers. (In lieu of speakers, students can prepare a panel discussion using newspaper and magazine accounts, as well as interviews with those involved, as source material).

4) Students should read The Virtue of Selfishness or some shorter piece by Ayn Rand (see Appendix, pp. 17-25 for article), or invite a local member of the Objectivists (those who follow Rand's philosophy of Objectivism) to speak. Discuss and evaluate her theory that private interest and social responsibility are vitally interrelated, that without private interest, there is no real social responsibility.

5) Students may role-play a confrontation between a leading member of the corporation Establishment and a protester based on the corporation man's statement that "What's good for my business is good for America." Students may want to use Al Capp's

comic strip characters General Bullmoose and SWINE (Students Wildly Indignant About Nearly Everything) as a stimulus for their own characterizations.

6) Form a panel to discuss the role of unions in today's work world. Have students describe the issues confronting unions, such as racial or sexual discrimination, limitation of new entrants into skilled crafts, closed shop. Students may prepare a tally sheet listing the union practices which demonstrate social responsibility on one side, and those which demonstrate private interest on the other. (Some overlap should be expected.) Students may consult friends and relatives who are union members, and local union officials as well as writing to the national headquarters of the AFL-CIO for literature.

EO#4 Describes the personal values and the social contributions of participation in community affairs as part of one's career.

Learning Experiences

1) Students -- individually or in small groups -- should survey the number and type of service organizations in the local community (Red Cross, Kiwanis, etc.) Ask them to describe the social contributions made by these organizations in light of the following questions:
   a) What functions do these organizations perform which might otherwise go unfulfilled?
   b) Are these services valuable to the community? To the individuals performing them? If so, how?
   c) Why do individuals participate in these organizations? What satisfactions do they get from such participation?

2) Invite local members of the community (Lions, Rotary, JC's, councilmen, mayor) to form a panel or to lecture and then discuss the relationship of service organizations and individual service to the community welfare. Students may use the general questions in EO#4-1 as a guide to framing more specific questions to ask the speakers.

3) Have students read Babbitt by Sinclair Lewis, and discuss the contributions made by George F. Babbitt and his fellow Boosters to community welfare. If necessary, the reading may be limited to Chapter 21. Discussion questions might include the following:
   a) Why does Babbitt join the Boosters?
   b) What benefits does he feel they provide the community?
   c) What personal benefits does he derive from membership?
   d) How does the author feel about the Boosters -- does he seem to consider it a good and useful organization?
   e) How do you feel about the Boosters?
   f) What similarities and differences do you see between the Boosters and one or more of your community's service organizations?

4) Each student should attend at least one function (meeting, rally, march) or a community group whose goal is social change, such as SDS, Moral Rearmament, civil rights groups, Women's Liberation, Students for Environmental Defense, Young Americans for Freedom, etc. Have them report to the class -- or arrange for a representative of the group to report -- how this group's goals can be implemented. The class as a whole may wish to consider the question of whether these goals should be implemented.

5) Ask the students what abilities are utilized in various school activities, such as student council. How do these parallel community activities? Each student may interview people involved in the community activities in which he is interested as to the talents and abilities required. In addition he may interview workers in his preferred occupation as to the types of community activities in which they are involved (see Appendix, p. 26 for questionnaire). Then have students analyze their own talents and abilities in terms of the type of personal contributions they might make to school and community affairs.

6) Have students, individually or in small groups, identify a community need with which they are concerned. Students may contact various community organizations (neighborhood house, PTA, YMCA) for suggestions and information on needs. They should then name the workers in the community who can help meet that need. (For example, if the need is for park space, then the workers might include gardeners, construction workers, playground equipment manufacturers as well as city officials.) Have them interview the workers to determine how the need can be met, reporting this information back to the class along with a description of the satisfactions, public and private, of meeting this need. A chart is provided (Appendix, p.27) which may be duplicated for students' use.

EO#5 Describes how work in America may help to overcome the social problems threatening mankind.

Learning Experiences

1) Ask students to name social problems which confront society today, listing them on the board. Then have students in small groups rank the problems listed in order of their importance, and suggest occupations which might help to alleviate these problems. The students should also ask their parents what they think are the problems facing society today, what social problems they encounter in their work, and how they deal with them. (see Appendix, p.28 for chart which may be duplicated for students' use in naming and ordering problems).

2) Students should read a book describing an ideal society, and describe to the class how work in that society is used to

overcome social problems. (see Appendix, p.29 for suggested book list). Each student may read a different book, or groups of three or four may read the same book and prepare a panel report.

3) Have students read and/or listen to the Beatles' song "Revolution," then answer and discuss the study questions. (see Appendix, pp.30-31 for words and questions).

4) Students, individually or in small groups, should choose a problem facing America today with which they are particularly concerned, and prepare a presentation on that problem for the class. The possibilities in this activity are endless, from simple factual report to a sound and light show or dramatization. Students may use photographic essays, popular or original music, poetry, sketches or one-act plays -- whatever media the student is most comfortable or most interested in. Students working on different problems may wish to combine forces where such combinations seem applicable. Each student, using the information gained in preparation for his presentation, may then prepare a report describing the relation of his preferred occupation(s) to social problems. He should consider the following questions, using the chart from EO#5-1 (Appendix, p.28) as a guide:
   a) Which problems might my work aggravate?
   b) How important are these problems to me?
   c) How might my work make society more as I would like to see it?
   d) Would my job still be necessary in society as I would like to see it?

   For additional information, the student may write to or interview workers in his preferred occupation.

Evaluation

The student should
1) List ways in which he can contribute to society through his work now.
2) List ways in which he will be able to contribute to society through his preferred occupation.
3) Describe the contribution of at least five of the workers studied in this learning package.
4) Describe how he could change society either through his preferred occupation or through his parent's occupation.

## REFERENCES

* Darcy, Robert L. and Powell, Phillip E. Manpower in Economic Education, Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1968.

Dictionary of Occupational Titles, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1965.

* Evans, M. Stanton. "The Gospel According to Ayn Rand," National Review, October 3, 1967, 1059-1063.

Hopke, William E. (Ed.) Encyclopedia of Careers and Vocational Guidance, New York: Doubleday, 1967.

* Lennon, John and McCartney, Paul. Revolution 1, Middlesex, England: EMI Records, 1968.

Lewis, Sinclair. Babbitt, New York: Doubleday, 1922.

Occupational Outlook Handbook, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, published biennially.

Rand, Ayn. The Virtue of Selfishness, New York: Signet, 1960.

* Smith, Adam. The Wealth of Nations, New York: Modern Library, 1934.

* Whitman, Walt. Leaves of Grass, New York: Aventine Press, 1931.

* References included in the following Appendix

# APPENDIX

QUOTES AND QUESTIONS FOR EO#1-2

Two Points of View

CASE #1

A janitor was asked to explain his job to the delegates of a valley-wide conference held by the Tennessee Valley Authority. Here is what he said:

> "I represent the janitors. We believe that a clean plant is an efficient plant. I think the other workers in the plant like a clean plant to work in -- better working conditions. This helps them produce more efficiently and provide inexpensive electric power and better flood control. And this gives the people of the Tennessee Valley a better life."*

CASE #2

Now, as you read the following statement (made by an aircraft worker), contrast how this man views his job with how the TVA employee looks upon his job:

> "You take this doohickus here -- I don't know what they call it. My job is to drill three holes in a triangle shape. All I do is set my pattern on the plate and drill the holes. They tell me it fits somewhere in the wing section. Norman, the shop foreman, was giving me some bull about how the airplane would fall apart without my three holes. Well ain't that great! Look, all I want is my $2.80 per hour. If three holes in a triangle will do it, that's fine. If they want 'em in a straight line, just give me the pattern and I'll do it, just so long as I draw my $2.80."**

Study Questions

Answer the questions for each of the men described above.

1) Does the work of this man contribute to the well-being of society? If so, how?

2) Does the worker believe his work has social value?

3) Does it matter whether or not he believes his work has social value?
   a) Could it affect the way in which he does his work? If so, how?
   b) Could it affect his personal sense of well-being? If so, how?

* Robert L. Darcy and Phillip E. Powell, Manpower and Economic Education, p. 155.

** Ibid., p. 156.

LIST OF WORKERS FOR EO#1-4

Accountant
Actor
Agronomist
Airplane Designer
Airplane Mechanic
Airplane Pilot
Anthropologist
Automotive Engineer
Babysitter
Baker
Beauty Operator
Biologist
Bricklayer
Carpenter
Chemical Engineer
Clerk
Clothes Designer
Composer
Construction Contractor
Controller
Cook
Dentist
Dietitian
Diplomat
Draftsman
Economist
Electrician
Embalmer
Farmer
General Practitioner
Historian
Industrial Designer
Journalist
Lawyer
Machinery and Tool Designer
Machinist
Mathematician
Metallurgist
Meteorologist
Minister
Musician
Nurse
Optician
Optometrist
Painter (Artist)
Pharmacist
Photographer
Physicist
Physician
Playwright
Plumber
Poet
Policeman
Priest
Professional Athlete
Psychologist
Radio Engineer
Refrigeration Engineer
Salesperson
Sanitary Engineer
Secretary
Sociologist
Statistical Clerk
Stone Mason
Surgeon
Surveyor
Teacher
Tool Maker
Veterinarian
Watchmaker
Welder
X-Ray Technician
Zoologist

POEM FOR EO#1-6

## I HEAR AMERICA SINGING

I hear America singing, the varied carols I hear,

Those of mechanics, each one singing his as it should be, blithe and strong,

The carpenter singing his as he makes ready for work, or leaves off work,

The boatman singing what belongs to him in his boat, the deckhand singing on the steamboat deck,

The shoemaker singing as he sits on his bench, the hatter singing as he stands,

The woodcutter's song, the ploughboy's on his way in the morning, or at noon intermission or at sundown,

The delicious singing of the mother, or of the young wife at work, or of the girl sewing or washing,

Each singing what belongs to him or her and to none else,

The day what belongs to the day -- at night the party of young fellows, robust, friendly,

Singing with open mouths their strong melodious songs.*

Discussion Questions:

1) Which occupations that Whitman lists do you feel are no longer appropriate to describe work in America? What occupations might you replace them with?

2) Why would you replace those occupations -- how has America changed since Whitman wrote the poem in the last half of the nineteenth century?

3) Why are the workers singing -- or, why do you think Whitman describes them as singing?

4) What is the significance of the line "Each singing what belongs to him or her and to none else"?

5) What might be some reasons why Whitman does not include occupations such as doctor, lawyer, teacher, politician? -- because they don't "work" in the sense that those mentioned do? -- because Whitman feels the workers he mentions have been ignored or slighted?

* Walt Whitman, Leaves of Grass, pp. 11-12.

6) Could you create a similar poem which seems to you to more truly describe workers in America today?
   a) What different workers, if any, would you use?
   b) What different verbs (crying, striking) would you use?

EXCERPT FOR EO#2-1

THE WEALTH OF NATIONS

"A workman not educated to this business, a pin factory, nor acquainted with the use of machinery employed in it, could scarce make one pin in a day, and certainly could not make twenty. But in the way in which this business is now carried on, not only the whole work is a peculiar trade, but it is divided into a number of branches, of which the greater part are likewise peculiar trades.

One man draws out the wire, another straightens it, a third cuts it, a fourth points it, a fifth grinds it at the top for receiving the head. To make the head requires two or three distinct operations; to put it on is a peculiar business; to whiten the pins is another. It is even a trade by itself to put them into the paper.

The important business of making a pin is, in this manner, divided into about 18 distinct operations. I have seen a small factory of this kind where ten men were employed, and where some of them consequently performed two or three distinct operations. But though they were very poor (and did not have the best of machinery) they could, when they exerted themselves, make among them about 12 pounds of pins a day. There are, in a pound, upwards of 4000 pins of a middling size. Those ten persons, therefore, could make among them upwards of 48,000 pins in a day. Each person, therefore, making a tenth part of 48,000 pins, might be considered as making 4800 pins in a day. But if they had all worked separately and independently, they certainly could not each of them made 20, perhaps not one pin in a day -- that is, not even a small part of what they are at present capable of performing, because of a proper division and combination of their labor on different questions."*

Discussion Questions:

1) Smith, in this excerpt, does not extend the principle of division of labor beyond one specific factory. Can you explain how this principle could apply not just to men in one factory, but to many factories? To industries within the nation? To nations?

2) Given that it is more efficient to divide pin making into "peculiar trades", does it matter which man learns which trade? If so, what factors make it matter?

3) Smith implies that it is better to produce 4800 pins (or whatever is being made) each day, than 20 or one or none. State some reasons why this might be so, or not.

4) The aircraft factory from EO#1-2 (p.11) uses division of labor. Do you think that the attitude of the worker quoted is in some way a result of the division of labor? He is clearly willing to utilize his abilities in his vocational task. How does this benefit society? Do you think his attitude hurts or benefits society?

* Adam Smith, The Wealth of Nations, pp. 4-5

5) Can non-use of vocational abilities also benefit society, as in soil-bank programs? Can you give other examples where non-use might benefit society?

# THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO AYN RAND

M. Stanton Evans

Who is Ayn Rand?

The question, which echoes the tagline of Miss Rand's most massive book and forms the title of an admiring study by her colleague Nathaniel Branden, needs answering. Most people know, of course, the surface data of Miss Rand's career. She is a famous novelist, a former writer for motion pictures, an expatriate from Russia with a Russian taste for long prophetic fiction. So much is clear.

Where she fits in the conceptual scheme of American politics is, however, more difficult to say. For Miss Rand is a kind of philosophical enigma — an anti-collectivist who proclaims herself, and is in turn proclaimed, an enemy to conservatives. That mixture of attributes has stirred controversy on the American Right ever since Whittaker Chambers reviewed her enormous novel, Atlas Shrugged, in the pages of this magazine some ten years ago this December.

Perhaps the most striking thing about Miss Rand's philosophizing is a certainty of tone and manner seldom equaled in political discourse. Miss Rand has, above all else, a profound sense of adequacy. She has set up shop as a combination system-builder, historian and political theorist and claims to have a self-enclosed logical and ethical position impregnable to critique. From this fastness she impartially belabors philosophers, clerics and politicians of every conceivable persuasion. She is ready to challenge all comers and thinks nothing of dismissing a battalion of sages with a single stroke of rhetoric.

Miss Rand is a scarifier in substance as well as tone. She takes obvious delight in turning all the accepted values topside down, embracing as virtues what everybody else considers vices. Foremost among her transvalued values, is selfishness, which she holds to be not only admirable but the key to all else that is worth admiring. To underscore the point, she has entitled one of her polemical books The Virtue of Selfishness. Her enthusiasms are few but notable: Aristotle, the American Founding Fathers, businessmen in the mould of Big Jim Fisk. All in all, she is probably the most thoroughgoing advocate of laissez-faire capitalism ever to set pen to paper, a fact she has symbolized by taking the dollar sign as the emblem of her order. If you could multiply Herbert Spencer by William Graham Sumner, you would get Ayn Rand.

Miss Rand's philosophy is spelled out by one of her novelist heroes as follows: "The first right on earth is the right of the ego. Man's first duty is to himself. His moral law is never to place his prime goal within the persons of others. His moral obligation is to do what he wishes, provided his wish does not depend primarily upon other men. This includes the whole sphere of his creative faculty, his thinking, his work. But it does not include the sphere of the gangster, the altruist and the dictator." Asked to expand the relevance of much fictional sentiment to her opinion, Miss Rand says the latter can be capsuled in a single phrase: "And I mean it!"

---

*National Review, Vol. 19, Oct. 5, 1967, pp. 1059-1063. Used by permission.

Unsurprisingly, these statements and others like them have brought the Randian system under punishing attack. La Pasionavie of self has been described as everything from an anarchist to an incipient Hitler. She has drawn editorial thunder from left and right -- Catholic priests, religious conservatives, liberals like Granville Hicks, socialists like Sidney Hock. She has even been attached in the collegiate New Individualist Review, a classical liberal journal in which her free-enterprising ways might be expected to be well if not enthusiastically received.

Despite the dismal universal hiss, Miss Rand's influence is wide and apparently spreading. Her books here gained a popular success which few of her critics, if any, have been able to attain. The Fountainhead, first of her novels to be published in this country, has now sold more than half a million copies in hard cover and better than a million in paper back. Atlas Shrugged, the author's answer to War and Peace, has sold nearly a million copies in combined hard-cover and paperback editions -- which, considering the length and repetitive nature of the books, is perhaps even more awesome then the performance of the less sententious Fountainhead.

Through her books, Miss Rand has attracted a coterie of followers who share her commitments and aversions. And there are signs -- reflected in the reportedly increasing readership of her publication, the Objectivist Newsletter -- that her creed is winning converts well beyond her immediate circle, particularly among young people. They, in turn, tend to canonize her and to treat any criticism of her movement as sacreligious. It would therefore seem important for conservatives to find out whether she is conducting the battle against collectivism well or ill. Or whether, in fact, she may not be doing some of both.

Although her critics do not spend much time acknowledging it, there are a number of subjects on which Miss Rand is right and respecting which her counsel is quite reliable. Foremost among these is that class of issues having to do with the secular conditions of freedom. She uses "freedom" in its strict and pristine sense, to mean the absence of coercion. She repeatedly stresses, as some who use the word do not, that it has to do with the removal of constraint, not with somebody's privilege of imposing constraint on somebody else. She appreciates the counterpoise of autonomies that constitutes true liberty, in which each man is free to swing his arms but not to connect with his neighbor's nose.

Miss Rand has, moreover, an excellent grasp of the way capitalism is supposed to work, the efficiencies of free enterprise, the central role of private property and the profit motive, the mutual benefits of free exchange, the social and political costs of welfare schemes which seek to compel a false benevolence. She is a powerful critic of bureaucrats, planners, and social engineers, and an effective satirist of the intellectual flux and slither in which modern relativism seeks to bury moral issues. No one is more relentless in exposing the shifting categories, begged questions, and bootlegged premises which characterize so much of current liberal discourse.

Enemy of Appeasement

Nor does this exhaust the catalogue of Randian virtues. She is also a trenchant anti-Communist and enemy of appeasement. Having lived in the Soviet Union, she knows the menace of Communism too well to accept the pacifism which has found lodgment in some professedly libertarian circles. By the same token, she is an intransigent critic of the domestic subversives and philosophical illiterates who have of late been indulging themselves in the right to riot. And, finally, she is a political realist, unwilling to accept the vapidities of me-tooism, ready to take up the cudgels for a political figure when she thinks his candidacy makes a difference. Her books abound with much good doctrine on these and other subjects.

Can anyone who has recoiled from the juiceless orthodoxies of the day fail to respond, in some degree, to Miss Rand's elaboration of such theories? Chambers was in error, I think, when he suggested that beneath the libertarian surface she was a kind of unconscious Nazi; he was misled by the imperious tone and Nietzschean exaltations. The resemblances to Nietzsche are unmistakable, but they end precisely where the will to power begins. Whatever else Miss Rand may be, she is an uncompromising libertarian, meticulously consistent in her distaste for all the compulsory "isms." That is, in a collectivist age, a rather important virtue.

It is the combination of real and libertarian clarity, indeed, which forms the most obvious basis of her appeal. That she has found so large an audience suggests she has touched some vital nerve deep within the exhausted tissue of our culture — some latent dissatisfaction with all the weasel words and soft evasions. Her unwillingness to compromise in tone or content has probed a secret redoubt where the American people are ready to affirm, with respect to the whole smarmy liberal ethic, that they are fed up. Her vindication of the person, her strident affirmations of freedom undefiled, cut through the fog and treacle like a sword of liberating vengenance. These are matters in which Miss Rand, in this writer's view, is most refreshingly right. And it is her rightness, I believe, which is chiefly responsible for her popular success. But there are other matters, unfortunately, in which she is depressingly wrong. And because the two are freely intermingled in her writing, there exists the danger that her bad counsel will be uncritically accepted along with the good. It is a danger which must be guarded against. For although she understands freedom very well as an existential proposition, Miss Rand shows no signs of understanding the spiritual and historical conditions that are antecendent to it.

Seeking a philosophical base for libertarian utopia, Miss Rand falls back upon what would seem, for someone who has witnessed the effects of Marxism, to be a much-discredited formula — the dogma of atheist humanism. If we would establish a free society, she says, we must make war upon religion — the Christian religion in particular. Religion is an irrational "mysticism," the realm of "witch doctors" and weaklings who make common cause with thugs and torturers. The "mysticism of mind" and the "mysticism of muscle" are, in the Randian conception of things, equally to be condemned.

This is in all major points, the standard left-liberal fare with which we have been regaled for years -- the very matrix of the relativism Miss Rand despises.

With Diderot, Feuerbach, Marx

How often have we heard the liberal history lesson rehearsed? Man had freedom during classical antiquity, lost it with the rise of the Middle Ages, regained it with the re-flowering of pagan themes in the Renaissance. We liberate man therefore by casting down the Christian idols and striking off the shackles of ancient superstition. That is your liberal history professor talking; also Ayn Rand. Diderot, Feuerbach and Marx, in different words and from different perspectives, have said it before. And now Miss Rand, at considerable length, is saying it all again. She is perhaps not to be severely blamed for reciting this secular mythology, since it is by now imbedded in the Jacobin recesses of modern textbooks and intellectual histories. But it should be apparent that, having swallowed the liberal history lesson whole, she is ill equipped to become the anti-liberal redeemer.

Miss Rand is in the difficult position of trying to combat a philosophical adversary while accepting his metaphysics -- an enterprise whose hazards, in other cases than her own, she fully understands. The Randian ethic is in fact but a particular instance of a problem which afflicts the whole of our society, liberal and conservative alike. She traverses the familiar questions: Can faith in God be reconciled with liberty for man? Is Christian belief compatible with libertarian attachment? Is capitalism anti-Christian? These are, it seems, central dilemmas of the era. The activities of the National Council of Churches -- to mention only one convenient example -- have raised them quite as sharply as has Atlas Shrugged. It should serve as some kind of warning to her followers that Miss Rand and the NCC, albeit from opposing sides of the issue, come to identical answers.

Let Christianity Go

Miss Rand believes as devoutly as did Walter Rauschenbusch that Christianity and capitalism are incompatible. She has merely made the opposite choice in deciding which of the two should be retained; she wants to keep the capitalism and let the Christianity go. The evil of the Christian faith, she says, is its emphasis on altruism. She thinks there is no idea more pernicious than that of denying oneself for the benefit of others. Her own basic value principle, the leading apothegm of Self, is that "an organism's life is its standard of value; that which furthers its life is the good; that which threatens it is evil." By which, she makes clear, she means physical life here on earth. Her ultimate standard of value, whence all else is to be derived, is thus the physical survival of the individual organism; efforts to establish criteria of behavior not referable to this ultima ratio are forays into "mysticism." Since Christianity attempts to set up such criteria, it is "anti-life" and tantamount to slavery.

Waiving the theological questions, let us simply inquire whether such a position will in fact lead on to freedom. Miss Rand is certain it does -- as certain that she says all subsidiary rules of liberty derive from the great primal insight of Christianity denied. But a little reflection should tell us otherwise -- as does, in fact, her own performance in subsequent elaborations of her system. For it becomes readily apparent that, by taking away the interior restraints of religious belief. Miss Rand also takes away some necessary elements of freedom. Liberty of the sort she wants cannot exist, after all, without limitations of some kind on the way individuals behave. Men who submit to the sway of impulse are not free, either psychologically or politically. Guided only by the physical imperatives of survival, a man might do almost anything -- including a number of things destructive to the Randian regime of freedom.

Such a man might, for example, become one of Miss Rand's principal villains, the "looter." Or, given a different temperament, he might become a bureaucrat, or a social engineer, or a politician. He might even go on welfare. In any of these capacities, he could very well insure his own physical survival while laying waste the general libertarian design. In which case it follows, as Miss Rand tacitly acknowledges, that naked survival will not do. The skeleton must be clothed. Thus we find her gradually reintroducing various moral restraints on individual behavior which her original definition has stripped away. These limitations, somewhat randomly set forward, are chiefly three: 1) "Survival" does not mean mere survival as an animal, but survival as "man qua man" -- that is, as being capable of dignity and noble aspirations; 2) Selfishness does not rule out "authentic benevolence" -- concern for others because they are, for various reasons, valued by the self; 3) Selfishness is premised on the understanding that rational men can think themselves into a proper regard for others, and will seek nothing from their neighbors which has not been earned. Taken together, these notions would obviously impose some limitations on would-be "looters" and other desirables. But what is there in Miss Rand's first principle that makes any one of them logical or necessary? In what way are they derivative from the physical survival of the individual organism?

Consider, for example, the case of a celebrated gentleman recently in the news who has followed his desire to tropic ports, violated the law, abandoned his wife, absconded with public funds, and is a liberal Democrat into the bargain. In what way does he violate the cardinal rule of Self? Miss Rand may attack him as an "animal," declare him lacking in authentic benevolence, accuse him of nodding over the Organon. So what? He is surviving, extending the sway of impulse, piling up some wealth, avoiding physical pain and death. Having lived out his deliciously selfish existence, he may very well expire in his sleep at the age of 93, a millionaire twice over. He will have survived as a physical organism very well indeed.

"Authentic benevolence" is, in such a case, particularly unrewarding. Miss Rand attempts to show that selfishness is compatible, e.g., with love of family -- since the family is an extension of the self. She cites in illustration a hypothetical case of false philanthropy, in which a man neglects his wife to spread largess among people he does

not know. True morality, she concludes, requires him to tend to his family, where his own personal interests lie. This allegedly proves the oneness of self with moral rectitude, the equation of "altruism" with immorality. But, as too often occurs. Miss Rand has skipped the hard questions to make verbal games with the easy ones.

The chief issue in this hypothetical situation, clearly, is not between one's family and the outside world, but between one's family and oneself. Miss Rand correctly denounces "altruists" who would neglect wife and children to mollycoddle strangers — although cases of this sort are, on the record, comparatively infrequent. She has nothing to say about the egotist who neglects wife and child to feed his appetites — a case which is much more common. Isn't the man who gambles, drinks, speculates or otherwise squanders time and resources on his own pursuits at the expense of his family acting out his own selfish vision of his life's fulfillment? And could not anyone who wanted to neglect his family justify his behavior in terms of Miss Rand's "survival" ethic? Such people can be rebuked only if one introduces an extraneous principle which has nothing to do with selfishness. The asserted modification of Miss Rand's philosophy must become, that is, a cancellation of it.

Finally, it seems most improbable that we can reason the immoralist into perceiving the grand design of liberty in which his own essential interests are engaged. It is a natural failing of mankind that long-term benefits seldom seem as vivid as immediate ones. Even the most intelligent men have trouble sorting out things on so starkly utilitarian a basis. How clear is it, for example, that subsidies and protective tariffs are in fact harmful to the subsidized and the protected? How easy is it to convince the businessman cleaning up on urban renewal or a government contract that he is disserving his own self-interest? Not very. The idea of mankind, devoid of all other ethical baggage, calmly thinking out the calculus of remote advantage at every juncture of life taxes credulity. It won't happen.

Even more to the point, it is apparent that many actions which weaken the general system of freedom are in no way materially harmful to the individuals who commit them, even over the long haul. Many criminals, deadbeats, tyrants, and demagogues have ravaged freedom quite thoroughly but managed to displace the retributive effects to contemporary scapegoats or future innocents. This is, in fact, the precise strategy of the Keynesian inflationists, who pay for today's handouts by debasing tomorrow's currency. In the long run, they tell us, we are all dead; let our children and grandchildren take the consequences. By what principle of selfishness will Miss Rand reproach these people?

There is, in sum, no reason to believe the generality of men can be made to subordinate impulse to "man qua man," "authentic benevolence," or long-range objectives purely as a matter of selfish calculation. Such self-restraint can take place on a wide scale only if it is supported by a system of belief predicated on something other than "survival." By removing Christianity from her libertarian conspectus, Miss Rand has eliminated one source of such belief. The question becomes what, if anything, she can offer as a replacement. The substitute authority, it becomes increasingly plain, is herself.

Miss Rand is in fact saying that man has a right to be selfish -- so long as he accepts certain pre-conditions laid down by Ayn Rand. Selfishness within the limits she has defined is permissible, but selfishness within limits defined by the individual himself is not. The enemy of "mysticism" is doing precisely what she attacks Christianity for doing: imposing on the individual standards derived from a source outside himself, displacing his judgment with her own. The new standard, contrary to the Categorical Imperative of Self, is in fact, not "survival" at all. It is simply the kind of behavior Ayn Rand actually applied to human beings.

Some years ago, in a piece for National Review, E. Merrill Root described Miss Rand as a kind of unknowing Christian. Her effort to render the unfettered individual discreetly manageable through cumulative provisos and prohibitions suggests that, in a certain structural sense, this is true. For the vindication of personality that she seeks -- the assertion of intrinsic human value framed in dignity -- happens to be Christian doctrine par excellence. Far from being a product of pagan or Renaissance "humanism," as the liberal history lesson teaches, and Miss Rand believes, the idea of personality is distinctively Christian. The free and sentient individual who respects the mutual claims of other individuals is chiefly a Christian and medieval conception. Liberty of the kind Miss Rand desires was unknown to the ancients; even Aristotle blandly asserts that the individual "belongs to the state." And of course pagan practice as a whole, premised in human slavery, fell far below the standards of an Aristotle or a Seneca.

The ancients could conceive of no authority higher than the polis; they believed the state had a total lien on man's energies and affections. It was Christianity which broke this metaphysical impasse and vindicated the integrity of the person, and it was the medieval era in which the doctrine of personality was perfected. Thanks to such "witch doctors" as Boethius and Athenagoras, Duns Scotus and Bonaventure, the free and individuated human being became a major element in Western thought. Nor was the idea confined to the monasteries. With the propagation of the Christian faith, as Lord Acton observed, conceptions which had hitherto been the elusive goal of "patient reasoners" became the common property of the world.

As for political practice, what are we to make of Miss Rand's assertion that Christianity, in keeping with all the despotisms known to man, held "morality was a code applicable to the individual, but not to society. Society was placed outside the moral law, as its embodiment or source or exclusive interpreter. . ."? How does one counter so bald an inversion of historical fact? The whole point of Christian Natural Law doctrine and Christian medieval practice was precisely that the state is subordinate to the moral law. It is just in this respect as Gierke notes, that Medieval statecraft differed most markedly from both antiquity and the Renaissance. Few topics have been so belabored by Christian writers, from Augustine to Hooker (and thence to Locke and America), from Ambrose to the Vinciciae Contra Tyrannos.

Miss Rand is of the opinion that limited government, with political authorities held accountable to the constitutional rule of law, sprang to life with the founding of the American union. This is of course untrue. In point of fact, the major features of our constitutional system were an inheritance by way of Great Britain, from the very Middle Ages Miss Rand detests. The idea of constitutionalism as we understand it is specifically medieval, spelled out by Bracton, Fortescue, and retrospectively by Coke; the idea of representative government we owe to the Christian notion of personality and the medieval conception of mutually binding covenants between king and subject; the federal dispersion of power, dependent on the integrity of convenants, is also a feudal survival; and the cornerstone of English and by extension American constitutionalism is that most medieval and feudal of documents, Magna Carta.

It is from these roots in the Christian Middle Ages that the lineaments of the free American order were derived. The ideas of personal liberty and limited government which Miss Rand cherishes were precisely the ideas bequeathed to us by the medieval world. They were also the ideas which Renaissance iconoclasm ripped from the soil of continental Europe, preparing the way for absolute monarchy, absolute Jacobinism, and absolute collectivism -- all giddily released from the moral restraints of the Christian medieval order. To read Miss Rand's statements on these matters is to get everything backwards -- and to learn how powerful and pervasive the liberal history lesson is.

The contemporary case against Miss Rand's position is quite as telling as the historical ones. Are the great modern collectivisms founded on a religious basis -- or are they nihilistic and atheist? Is an excess of religion a leading characteristic of our own liberal-collectivist society -- or banish all vestiges of piety from our national life? The questions answer themselves. Secularist and anti-clerical themes in the modern world go hand in hand with the very relativism and collectivism Miss Rand so properly condemns.

It is true, as noted, that many modern Christians wind up supporting various kinds of collectivism, just as it is true that Christian doctrine in years past has been used as a pretext for theocracy, inquisition, and Caesaro-Papism. But it should be apparent that the extent to which the National Council of Chruches thrusts itself into the political maw of liberalism is also the extent to which it abandons traditional Christian doctrine, making common cause with the Jacobins and liberals. The same is true of previous perversions of the Christian message. Indeed, the very standard of liberty by which it is possible to determine that these things are perversions is derived from the Christian tradition, since there is nothing in the ad lib of neo-paganism which submits the political authorities to higher standards than their own desires. We know Caesaro-Papism, witch-burnings and National Council welfarism are wrong for the same reason we know antique slavery. Renaissance despotism, and Communist blood purges are evil; because they conflict with the central precepts of Christian ethical and social teaching.

Miss Rand's philosophy thus issues in the most incredible of ironies: She rightly prizes freedom and attacks the collectivists who would destroy it. But in the deeper realms of thought where the combat must finally be joined she reverses her commitments; she attacks the Christian culture which has given birth to all our freedoms and takes her stand with the destroyers. Having flung the defi gallantly before the liberal host and marched steadfast into battle, she wheels about and embraces the standard of the enemy. That embrace and the paradox it seals are fatal to morality and liberty alike.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EO#4-5

1. Are you active in community organizations? If so, which ones?

2. What talents and abilities are needed in these organizations?

3. Are these talents and abilities the same as or different from the talents and abilities you use in your work?

4. Is involvement in community affairs important to you? Why or why not?

5. Does your career allow you to become involved in community affairs?

6. Does your career hamper such involvement directly or indirectly (i.e. time and space limitations)? If so, in what ways?

7. Is there an expectation on the part of your company or organization that you be involved in community affairs? If so, why?

8. Do you think that the business world should stress involvement in community affairs? Why or why not?

CHART FOR EO#4-6

| COMMUNITY NEEDS | WORKERS WHO CAN HELP MEET NEED | WAYS THEY CAN HELP MEET NEED | SATISFACTIONS OF MEETING NEED |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

CHART FOR EO#5-1

| SOCIAL PROBLEMS | ORDER OF IMPORTANCE | OCCUPATION WHICH COULD HELP ALLEVIATE PROBLEM | MY PREFERRED OCCUPATION CONTRIBUTES TO THE PROBLEM | NO EFFECT | HELPS ALLEVIATE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| OVERPOPULATION | | | | | |
| POLLUTION | | | | | |
| DRUG ABUSE | | | | | |
| POVERTY | | | | | |
| CRIME | | | | | |
| WAR | | | | | |
| RACISM | | | | | |
| ANARCHY | | | | | |
| FASCISM | | | | | |
| MENTAL ILLNESS | | | | | |
| OTHERS: | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

SUGGESTED BOOK LIST FOR EO#5-2

Titles are followed by paperback publishers, prices, # of pages.

Bellamy, Edward. Looking Backward. Lancer, 60¢; 240 pp.

Butler, Samuel. Erewhon. Airmont, 50¢; 222 pp.

Clarke, A. C. Childhood's End. Ballatine, 75¢.

Huxley, Aldous. Brave New World. Bantam, 95¢.

Miller, W. M. Jr. A Canticle for Leibowitz. Bantam, 95¢.

More, Sir Thomas. Utopia. Penguin, 95¢; Washington Square press, 60¢.

Orwell, George. 1984. Signet, 75¢; 200 pp.

Plato. The Republic. Barnes and Noble, $1.

Rand, Ayn. Atlas Shrugged. Signet, $1.50; 1084 pp.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques. The Social Contract. Penguin, $1.25; 223 pp.

Skinner, B. F. Walden Two. Macmillan, $1.95.

Swift, Jonathan. Gulliver's Travels (part IV). Airmont, Washington Square Press, 50¢; 67 pp.

Tolkien, J. R. R. The Hobbit. Ballentine, 95¢; 144 pp.

Voltaire, F. A. Candida. Airmont, Ballentine, 60¢; 144 pp.

Page 30 has been removed because it is copyrighted. It contains Revolution by John Lennon and Paul McCartney, from the White album.

Questions for EO#5-3

REVOLUTION 1
Lennon/McCartney

1. To whom do you think this song is addressed? Why?

2. Line 3 reads "We all want to change the world." Do you think the authors believe that? Who is included in "we all"?

3. What do you think is the relationship between "revolution" and "evolution" other than that they rhyme?

4. What does the song say about the use of violence in effecting change?

5. The second stanza starts
You say you got a real solution
Well you know
We'd all love to see the plan
Do you think the authors are being ironic? Why or why not? Are there any hints in the song as to what <u>their</u> plan, if any, for changing the world involves?

6. The last verse includes the lines
You tell me it's the institution
Well you know
You better free your mind instead
which suggest that perhaps some of our problems lie not in the system but in our perceptions of the system. Can you explain how this might be? How can you "free your mind"? From what do you think they want you to free it?

7. The lyrics repeatedly suggest that "It's gonna be alright"—why? Do you think the authors believe it? Do you believe it?

8. Do you think that the Beatles' music has any value other than entertainment? If so, in what way?

9. Do you think that the Beatles and other artists are trying, through their work, to change the world? Do you think that their music has had any influence on people? If so, in what way?

10. Has the Beatles' music had any effect on you and your attitudes? If so, in what way?

11. Do you think that musicians should express their political and social views in their music? Why or why not?

12. Should any worker express his political and social views through his work? Is it always possible to work without expressing those views, directly or indirectly?

13. Are there some occupations which allow for more expression of political and social views than others?

14. Does your preferred occupation allow for expression of your political and social views? If so, how?